

Civil. Revin. appln. No 390/1933.

In His Majesty's High Court of Judicature
Appellate Side, Bombay



(CIVIL JURISDICTION)

Civil Revision Application No. 390 of 1933.

Appeal No. of 19 from Appellate Decree

The Khandesh Laxmi Vilas Mills Co. Ltd.
Jalgaon having its registered office at Jalgaon
East Khandesh by its managing Valinotar —
Shravan H. Chandhari

Applicant.

Appellant

(Original Opponent ~~Left~~)

versus

The Firm trading in the name of the
Graduate Coal Concern, Jalgaon;

Opponent.

Respondent

(Original Applicant ~~Left~~)

Claim Rs.

„ for pleader's fee.

Vakil for Appellant—Messrs. W. B. Pradhan & G. S. Gupta.

Vakil for ~~Respondent~~ ^{Opponent}—Messrs. A. G. Desai & P. B. Gajendragadkar.

In His Majesty's High Court of Judicature,
Appellate Side, Bombay

~~APPEAL~~
CIVIL REVISION APPLICATION No. 390 of 1933

District. E. Khandesh

No. of paper.

Particulars.

I. Papers to be preserved.

- 1 Copy of the Judgment of the lower appellate Court if printed.
- 2 Copy of the Judgment of the original Court (if printed).
- 3 Interlocutory Judgment of the High Court (if any).
- 4 Findings.
- 5 1 Judgment (Final) of the High Court.
- 6 2 ~~Order~~ of the High Court.
- 7 Judgment in Review Petition.
- 8 Judgment of the High Court in the matter of leave to appeal to the Privy Council.
- 9 Judgment, decree and order of the Privy Council.
- 10 Printed copy of the Privy Council record.
- 11 3 Memo. of appeal in ~~appeals or applications summarily dismissed~~

II. Papers to be destroyed under the Rules.

- 1 Memo. of appeal (in admitted cases).
- 2 Manuscript copy of the Judgment of appellate Court.
- 3 Manuscript copy of the decree of appellate Court.
- 4 Manuscript copy of the ^{Application in suit with order.} Judgment of original Court.
- 5 Manuscript copy of the decree of original Court.
- 6 Application for return of the above copies.
- 7 2 Vakalatnama of Mr. ^{W. B. Brahmanand} ~~for the appellant.~~ ^{W. B. Brahmanand}
- 8 Civil application for delay being excused with affidavit.
- 9 Application for copies.
- 10 Application for search.
- 11 Letter intimating dismissal where the order is of dismissal.
- 12 3 Notice.
- 13 4 Letter transmitting notice with District Judge's endorsement thereon, etc.
- 14 5 R. and P. writ.
- 15 Application No. of 1933 for ^{substitution of heirs.} ~~fresh notice.~~

- 15 Fresh Notice (to heir).
- 16 Letter transmitting notice with District Judge's endorsement thereon, etc.
- 17 Vakalatnama of Mr. *A. G. Desai* *Apponent* for the respondent.
P. B. Jambharkar
- 18 Memo. of cross-objections.
- 19 Application for copies.
- 20 Application for search.
- 21 Writ sending down issues when there is a separate Judgment.
- 22 Notice of receipt of findings.
- 23 Objections to findings.
- 24 7 Writ communicating final decree or order to the lower Court.
- 25 8 Receipt of R. and P. by the District Judge.
- 26 Review Petition.
- 27 Affidavit in support of do. if any.
- 28 Vakalatnama if any.
- 28A. Application for a certificate to appeal under the Letters Patent.
- 29 Application for leave to appeal to His Majesty's Privy Council.
- 30 Notice in do.
- 31 Writ for R. and P. in do.
- 32 Certificate granting leave to appeal.
- 33 Writ or letter of intimation in cases where rule is discharged.
- 34 Receipt of papers.

hbbk.
Clerk.

Assistant Sheristedar.

CIVIL REVISION APPLICATION No. 390 OF 1933.

The Khandesh Laxmi Vilas Mills Company Ltd., Jalgaon,
 having its registered Office at Jalgaon, East Khandesh, by
 its managing Vahiwatdar Shravan H. Chaudhari. (Original
 Opponent—Defendant No. 1) ... Applicant.

versus

The Firm trading in the name of the Graduate Coal Concern,
 Jalgaon. (Original Applicant—Plaintiff) ... Opponent.

Application praying for setting aside the orders passed by R. G. Shirali,
 Esquire, First Class Subordinate Judge at Jalgaon, on exhibit No. 90, and
 also for calling the Record and Proceedings in Special Regular Suit No. 92
 of 1928.

Counsel Dr. Ambedkar with Messrs. W. B. Pradhan and G. S. Gupte for
 the Applicant.

Messrs. A. G. Desai and P. B. Gajendragadkar for the Opponent.

4th July 1934.

(Coram :—Murphy, Acting C. J., and Macklin J.)

Oral Judgment (per Macklin J.):—This is an application to revise an order of the First Class Subordinate Judge of Jalgaon amending a decree in such a way as to bring the name of the applicant upon the decree as judgment-debtor. The applicant is a company known as the Khandesh Laxmi Vilas Mills Company. They were sued by a concern known as the Graduate Coal Concern on a mortgage. A preliminary decree was passed on the mortgage, and the plaintiffs at a later stage applied under exhibit 56 to have the decree made final. The decree was made final under exhibit 86. Then the Graduate Coal Concern applied in execution proceedings to have the property brought to sale. Notice of the execution proceedings was sent to the Khandesh Laxmi Vilas Company; but they put in an application alleging that the final decree was not binding upon them inasmuch as they had not been a party to that decree. This application was heard, and it was decided that the final decree was not binding upon the Khandesh Laxmi Vilas Company because it could not be said that the decree had been made final against the company owing to the way in which the company had been described. The Graduate Coal Concern then asked for leave to amend their application exhibit 56, and for the decree to be amended by inserting the name of the Khandesh Laxmi Vilas Company in clear terms. Both the application for final decree and the final decree itself were accordingly amended. The Khandesh Laxmi Vilas Company has now applied in revision against those amendments.

It is contended that the learned Subordinate Judge had no jurisdiction to amend the final decree at that stage of the proceedings, since he was *functus officio*. Moreover, so it is said, the correct procedure would have been to appeal against the finding in the execution proceedings that the final decree was not binding upon the Khandesh Laxmi Vilas Mills Company. We do not agree. Under section 152 of the Civil Procedure Code the Court has an inherent power to vary or amend its own decrees or orders so as to carry out its own meaning. There is plenty of authority quoted in support of this in Sir Dinshaw Mulla's Civil Procedure Code, and it appears that the Subordinate Judge who heard the application for execution ought to have found that all that had happened was a mistake on the part of the ministerial servant of the Court in drawing up the decree. The decree was apparently drawn up

in the terms of the interlocutory application, exhibit 56, for a final decree. But it ought to have been drawn up according to the final order of the Judge himself, which was to the effect that there should be a final decree against the defendants; and it is customary, and indeed obligatory, upon the ministerial servant of the Court who draws up decrees to take the names of the parties as they appear in the plaint. The applicant company was correctly described in the plaint, and all that was necessary was for the final decree to be amended so as to give the names of the defendants as they were described in the plaint. In effect what the learned Subordinate Judge whose action is not criticised has done is to give effect to section 152 of the Civil Procedure Code and to exercise his inherent powers of amending a decree in such a way as to bring it into conformity with the meaning of the Court which ordered the decree to be passed.

We see no reason to interfere and we discharge the rule with costs. The Stay Application also is discharged with costs.

By order of the Court,

R. B. Bhandari

Registrar.

*Examined by M.B.
Read by C.H.A.*

Civil Revision Application No. 390 of 1933.

The Khandesh Laxmi Vilas Mills Company
Ltd., Jalgaon, having its registered
Office at Jalgaon, East Khandesh, by its
managing Vahiwatdar Shraavan ~~Hander. H.~~
Chaudhari, ~~of Jalgaon.~~ } Applicant.
(Original Opponent- Defendant No.1.)

versus

The Firm trading in the name of the
Graduate Coal Concern, Jalgaon } Opponent.
(Original Applicant - Plaintiff.)

Application praying for setting aside the
orders passed by R.G.Shirali, Esquire, First Class
Sub-Judge at Jalgaon, on Exhibit No. 90 and also for
calling the R & P in Special Regular Suit No. 92 of
1928.

Counsel Dr.Ambedkar with Messrs
W.B.Pradhan & G.S. Gupte for the
Applicant.

Messrs A.G.Desai & P.B.Gajendragadkar
for the Opponent.

4th July 1934.

(Coram :- Murphy Ag.C.J. & Macklin J.)

Oral Judgment (per Macklin J.) :-

x x x

By order of the Court,

Sd/- R.S. Bavdekar

Registrar

JYE.

G. P. — (J) J 210—3000—11-32—P8

G.R., No. 4398 dated 3-7-16

[Spl. — H.C. A.S. Civil 56]

Appeal No. *390* of 193*3* from ~~Original~~
~~Appellate~~ Decree.

Date of decision

For approval and signature

The Hon'ble *the Dy. Chief* Justice

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice

Blackburn: A.S.

Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment?

To be referred to the Reporter or not?

Yes

Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment?

No

SL
12.7.34.

C. R. A. No. 390 of 1933.

Dr. Ambedkar with Mr-W.B.Pradhan
for the applicant.
and Mr. P. B. D. Jayaraman
Mr. A.G.Desai for the opponent.

Coram - Murphy Ag.C.J., and Macklin J.

4th July 1934.

Oral Judgment per Macklin, J -

This is an application to revise an order of the First Class Subordinate Judge of Jalgaon amending a decree in such a way as to bring the name of the applicants upon the decree as judgment-debtors. The applicants ~~are~~ is a company known as the Khandesh Laxmi Vilas Mills Company. They were sued by a concern known as the Graduate Coal Concern on a mortgage. A preliminary decree was passed on the mortgage, and the plaintiffs at a later stage applied under Ex. 56 to have the decree made final. The decree was made final ~~and the copy of the final decree is Ex. 86.~~ *under ext. 86.* Then the Graduate Coal Concern applied in execution proceedings to have the property brought to sale. Notice of the

7

execution proceedings was sent to the Khandesh
Laxmi Vilas Company, but they put in an appli-
cation alleging that the final decree was not
binding upon them inasmuch as they ^{had} ~~have~~ not been
a parties^y to that decree. This application
was heard, and it was decided that the final
decree was not binding upon the ^{Khandesh} ~~Laxmi~~ Vilas
Company because it could not be said that the
decree had been made final against the company
owing to the way in which the company had
been described. The Graduate Coal Concern
then asked for leave to amend their application
Ex. 56, and for the decree to be amended by
inserting the name of the Khandesh Laxmi Vilas
Company in clear terms. Both the application
for final decree and the final decree itself
were accordingly amended. The Khandesh Laxmi
Vilas Company has now applied in revision again
st ^{upon} ~~that order.~~ amendments.

2

It is contended that the learned Sub-
ordinate Judge had no jurisdiction to amend
the final decree at that stage of the proceed-
ings, since he was functus officio. Moreover,

So it is said,

the correct procedure would have been to appeal against the finding in the execution proceedings that the final decree was not binding upon the Khandesh Laxmi Vilas Company. We do not agree. The Court has an inherent power to vary or amend its own decrees or orders so as to carry out its own meaning. There is plenty of authority quoted in support of this in Sir Dinshaw Mulla's Civil Procedure Code, and it appears that the Subordinate Judge who heard the application ^{for execution} ~~and the present applicants~~ ~~when they stated that the final decree was not binding upon them then~~ ought to have found that all that had happened was a mistake on the part of the ministerial servant of the Court in drawing up the decree. The decree was apparently drawn up in the terms of the interlocutory application, Ex. 56, for a final decree. But it ought to have been drawn up according to the final order of the Judge himself, which was to the effect that there should be a final decree against

Recd typed
23/7/34

Cop for Frank del
Conch.

De
6.7.34

(2 Copies for DR & BR)

Bio Rev. ~~11/11~~ 390 of 1933

4-7-1934.

15 copies

Sent to G. C. P.
24-7-34
F. P. recd 31-7-34
Recd at 21-7-34
S. P. recd 2-8-34
Recd at 21-8-34
Clean copy recd
4-8-34
Sub 4-8-34
Recd at 6-8-34
Sent for Copies
6-8-34

217

the defendants; and it is customary, and indeed obligatory, upon the ministerial servants of the Court who draw up decrees to take the names of the parties as they appear in the plaint. The applicant company was correctly described in the plaint, and all that was necessary was for the final decree to be amended so as to give the name of the defendants as they were described in the plaint. In effect what the learned Subordinate Judge whose action is now criticised has done is to give effect to section 152 of the Civil Procedure Code and to exercise his inherent powers of amending a decree in such a way as to bring it into conformity with the meaning of the Court which ordered the decree to be passed.

712

We see no reason to interfere and we discharge the rule with costs. The stay application also is discharged with costs.

4

IN HIS MAJESTY'S HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

ORDER passed by the High Court in the case of

*The Khandesh Laxmi Vilas
Mills Coy Ltd Jalgaon having its
registered office at Jalgaon by its Vahi
Waldar Shrawan H. Choudhari*

2
APPELLANT
APPLICANT

(Original *Sept No 1*)
versus

*The firm trading in the name
of the Graduate Coal Concern
Jalgaon.*

RESPONDENT
OPPONENT

(Original *plff*)
being ~~Appeal~~ Civil Revision Application No. *390* of 193*3* from Decree—

Coram— (*Murphy, Acting J & Macklin*)

For the reasons stated in the accompanying judgment

~~The~~ Court ~~discharges~~ ~~makes absolute~~ with costs the Rule granted by it on the *1st* day of *December*

193*3* whereby the Opponent ~~was~~ ~~were~~ required to show cause why the decision of the *First*
Class Sub Judge of *Jalgaon* in *sp. Reg suit* No. *92* of 192*8*
should not be set aside.

Dated this *4th* day of *July* 193*4*.

J. C. Chak
Deputy Registrar.

CIVIL APPLICATION No. **390** OF 1933 IN APPEAL No. **OF 192**

FROM ~~ORIGINAL~~ **DECREE**
~~APPELLATE~~

Bill of Costs in the High Court.

	By the Appellant or Applicant	By the Respondent or Opponent	By the Respondent or Opponent
	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
Stamps for Memorandum of Appeal Application	4-0-0 ✓		
Stamp for Copies of Decrees and Judgments or Orders	1-0-0 ✓		
Stamps for Vakalatnama	2-0-0	4-0-0 ✓	
Stamps for applications to enter the names of the heirs of the deceased			
Stamp for application for calling for additional papers	0-0-0	0-12-0 ✓	
Bhatta for Process	2-8-0 ✓		
Sectioner's Fee	4-1-0 ✓		
Vakil's Fee	30-0-0	30-0-0 ✓	
Printing Charges			
Copying Charges for preparing paper-books			
Stamp for affidavit			
Search Fee			
Stamp for Memorandum of Cross-objections...			
Vakil's Fee in the matter of Cross-objections...			
Costs at the trial of issue sent down			
Translation Fee			
Copying Fee under Rule 80 or 20 of the High Court, Appellate Side Rules, 1929			
Total	43-9-0	34-12-0	

Final
Taxing Officer.

Deputy Registrar.

The 4th day of July

1934

IN HIS MAJESTY'S HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY.

Civil Revision Application No. 390 of 1933:

The Khandesh Laxmi Vilas Mills Company } Petitioner.
Limited, Jalgaon, having its registered } (Ori. Opponent)
Office at Jalgaon, East Khandesh, by its } Deft No. 1
managing Valivadar Shri. Anand Hanu Chaudhari }
of Jalgaon. versus.

The Firm trading in the name of the } Opponent.
Graduate Coal Concern, Jalgaon. ... } (O. Applicant)
Puff

Claim Rs.

The Humble Petition of the
Petitioner above-named,

Respectfully sheweth:--

- (1) That the Opponent filed Sp. Reg. Suit No. 92 of 1928 to recover Rs. 31,923-13-0 on a simple mortgage dated 11th December 1925.
- (2) That a Preliminary decree was passed in favour of the Opponent on 31st July 1931.
- (3) That the Opponent on 19th January 1932 filed Ex. 56, an application for making the decree final. To this application Ex. 56 the Petitioner Company was not made a party. The parties thereto were the managing agents of the Company and the Receivers.
- (4) That as prayed for in Ex. 56 a final decree Ex. 86 was passed on 29th August 1932. To this final decree Ex. 86 the Petitioner Company was not a party- Defendant. The defendants were the managing Agents of the Company and the Receivers.
- (5) That in execution of the said final decree Ex. 86

the Opponent filed Spl. Reg. Darkhast No. 1546 of 1933 on 26th October 1932 bringing to ^{sale} ~~the~~ ~~sell~~ property belonging to the Petitioner Company.

(6) That in the execution proceedings the Petitioner Company by Misc. Application No. 331 of 1933 opposed the application for execution on two grounds viz.: (1) that it was not a party - Defendant to the final decree sought to be executed against its property and (2) that no notice to show cause why the final decree should not be ~~passed~~ passed was served on the Petitioner before Ex. 86 was passed.

(7) Both the contentions above-referred to were upheld by the First Class Sub-Judge who held that the final decree Ex. 86 not being a decree against the Petitioner Company could not be executed against the property of the Company and consequently the Opponent's Darkhast No. 1546 of 1933 was dismissed on 23-3-1933.

(8) That after the dismissal of the said Darkhast the Opponent made an application Ex. 90 dated 5-4-1933 praying that both Ex. 56, the application for making the decree final and Ex. 86, the final decree itself be amended in such a manner as to make Ex. 86 a decree against the Petitioner Company.

(9) That the Lower Court granted the said application Ex. 90 and on 17th July 1933 ordered Ex. 56 to be amended as prayed for by the Opponent and issued notice to the Petitioner Company to show cause why the final decree Ex. 86 should not also be similarly amended.

(10) That in spite of the Opposition of the Petitioner Company the Lower Court on 14-8-1933 ordered Ex. 86 the final decree to be amended as prayed for by the Opponent.

(11) That in doing so the Petitioner submits that the Lower Court has erred on the following among other grounds:--

- (1) The Lower Court had no jurisdiction to entertain the application Ex. 90.
- (2) The Lower Court had no jurisdiction to amend Ex. 56 after the final decree in the suit was passed on 29th August 1932.
- (3) The Lower Court had no jurisdiction to amend the final decree which was held to be not a decree against the Petitioner-Company so as to transform it into a decree against the Petitioner-Company.
- (4) That the amendment allowed by the Lower Court amounts in law to adding to the decree a party who was not before a party thereto. It ^{virtually} ~~virtually~~ amounts to passing a new decree against the Petitioner-Company.
- (5) That the Opponent's cause of action for obtaining a final decree became merged in Ex. 86 the final decree passed on 29th August 1932; and so long as Ex. 86 the final decree against the managing Agents of the Company and the Receivers, was not legally vacated by a suit brought for the purpose, the Lower Court had no jurisdiction to effect the amendments above referred to in an application to amend the decree.

(6) Under the circumstances Your Lordships will be pleased to call for the record of the case and set aside the orders passed by the 1st Class Sub-Judge on 17th July 1933 and on 14th August 1933.

And for this Act of kindness Your Lordships' --
Petitioner shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

BOMBAY,
November 1933.

M. B. Graham
Advocate for the Applicant.

In the High Court of Judicature at Bombay ¹⁹³³

The Khandesh Lakshmi Vilas Mills CO. Ltd. Applicant.

Vs.

Graduate Coal Concern, Respondant.

I, Shrawan Handu Chaudhari, Agent of the Khandesh Laxmi Vilas Mills Co. Ltd., applicant, solemnly affirm ~~and~~ as follows:-

The contents of the Affidavit made on the 23/1/34 at the Hon. High Court by Mr. Ratilal Bhaidas Daftari, managing partner of the respondent firm, are not true.

The statement therein that the mortgaged property is written only Rs. 20,000/-, is not true.

The Oil Mill and the machinery of the Mill is in excellent condition.

This Mill is in a condition of being worked by means of three expellers.

All the machinery is in good order.

None of the three expellers is impaired. Their capacity of work is not lessened.

The statement that the Oil Mill is closed for last six years is not true.

The Oil Mill is in the charge and under management of the Receiver. He has preserved the Oil Mill and the machinery in good condition. He is taking every care to the effect that the price of the machinery does not depreciate and also that the working capacity of the machinery is not lessened.

The price of the property in dispute has not depreciated. In Jalgaon there are three Oil Mills working at present, besides the oil Mill of the Company.

One of them is situated closely to this. Mill. It works on six expellers and is working day and night.

Every kind of produce of this Mill is sold as it is



Read affidavit
S. Handu
1-2-34

is produced. Similarly the oil and cakes produced by the other (two) mills is also sold immediately after it is produced.

In case the oil Mill of the Company is set working, the oil and oilcake it will produce will be sold immediately (in no time).

There is no depression at all in the business of oil mills or of the oil trade in Jalgaon. Jalgaon has satisfactory sufficient supply of the necessary raw material namely groundnuts. The present rates of the groundnuts and of the oil produced justify the conclusion that the oil mills and oil trade are and must be working at a profit.

According to the present rates of Groundnuts and the oil at Jalgaon, a Mill worked by three expellers ought to work at a profit of 200/- rupees every day. No part of the oil or oil cake produced from every day by the neighbouring six expeller oil Mill is remains unsold. So is the case with the other Mills. Their produce is in good demand.

The oil produced by our Company is of a better quality as the filter press in our Mill are of the best type and quality. The percentage of the oil produced by our expeller is at least 46% . That was the percentage when our mill was in operation (working).

The condition of the oil Mill is excellent. And that in case the mill is worked it will work at a fair profit, is known to Mr. Ratilal Bhaidas.

Ratilal Bhaidas has made untrue statements in his Affidavit D/- as he is anxious to secure our Mill at cheap price. He has started negotiations with Rupchan Gopal Marwadi in conjunction with whom he intends to secure the Mill.

The extent of the plot on which the mill stands is 5 Acres, 29 Gunthas. The whole land is turned into non-agricultural land. There are houses built round about that land and these houses are inhabited. Similarly there is a Chawl in front of the Mill. This belongs to Mr. Mahammad

Mahammad Hussain. This Chawl is also inhabited. The land in which Mill stands is very convenient for the purpose of being divided into small plots for buildings. This land can be divided into 500 plots each of 24'x 13'. Each of these plots can be sold for Rs. 150/-. There is a demand at present for 130 such plots. At this rate, the value of this whole plot of land will be Rs. 75,000/-

If our Mill starts working, it will bring 200/- Rs. daily. That should be the basis for the valuation of this oil Mill. Accordingly the price of the oil Mill is many times more than the mortgage money or the sum of Rs. 20,000/-. The value of the mortgaged property is not inadequate to meet the charge. Even assuming that there is any deficit, the company has other valuable property besides.

The Company have to recover a sum of Rs. 60,000/- in regard of their share money.

The statements made by Mr. Ratilal Bhaidas are untrue and are made by him knowing them to be untrue.

The reasons given by the opponent in his application to secure the cancellation of the interim stay order are not true.

The oil Mill was closed in August 1930 by the Lessee in collusion with the opponent. The Mill was closed by the Lessee as suit No; 609 of 1930 and a Receiver was appointed in September 1930.

galsan
29-1-34

S. H. Chaudhary

Solemnly affirmed before me by
Who is identified before me by
Whom I personally know.
Dated 29-1-34

S. H. Chaudhary

Clerk of the Court

affidavit by The
applicant - in CPA. 390/33

McKinnon

S. H. Chambers

2-1-33
S. H. Chambers

PRESENTATION FORM

(DUPLICATE) to be given to party or Advocate.

App No. of 193

Stamp No. District

Advocate Mr.

Received Court Fee Stamps as follows :—

Rs. as.

On the Memo of Appeal or Application.
Cross-objection.

On the Vakilpatra ...

On the copies ...

Total Rs. ...

Total Rs. and annas only.

This day of 193

Person presenting for Appellant or Applicant.
Respondent or Opponent.

Receiving Clerk.

Stamp No.

Paid additional Court Fee Stamps of
Rs. () only
on (memo, etc.)

This day of 193

Person paying.

Receiving Clerk.

Bhatta Register No.

Paid for Bhatta Court Fee Stamps of
Rs. () only.

This day of 193

Person paying.

Receiving Clerk.

Paid printing charges Rs.

on 193

Person paying.

Clerk.

PRESENTATION FORM (ORIGINAL)

C.R. Application No. of 1933

Stamp No. 5334 District E. Khandesh

Advocate Mr. W.B. Pradhan
Mr. G.S. Guppte

Presented with Court Fee Stamps as follows:—

Rs. as.

On the Memo of ~~Appeal or Application.~~ Cross-objection. 4-0

On the Vakilpatra ... 2-0

On the copies ... 1-0

Total Rs. ... 7/-

Total Rs. Seven and annas nil only.

This 6th day of November 1933

W.B.
Person presenting for ~~Appellant or Applicant.~~
~~Respondent or Opponent.~~

Phurba
Assistant Sheristedar.

Stamp No.

Received additional Court Fee Stamps of

Rs. () only

on memo
copies

This day of 1933

Receiving Clerk.

Stamp Register No. 5534

District— *E. Khandesh*

Advocate Mr. *W. B. Pradhan +*
G. S. Gupta

Office Note

CIVIL REVISION APPLICATION

No. *390* OF 193 *3*

Rule

1/12 *11/2*

Claim—Rs. */*

No. of opponents *1*

Receive Bhatta Rs. *2* As. *8*

Clerk.

MB
Assistant Sheristedar.

Bhatta Register No. *1725/1*

Received for Bhatta Court fee Stamps of
Rs. (*2-8-0*) *two James eight* only.
This *6th* day of *December* 193*3*.

MB
Clerk, Nazir's Department.

Farad prepared on— *22-1-34*

R. and P. Writ prepared on— *15-1-34*

Date of hearing— *20/2/34*

Entered in the Register on— *9/11/33*

CIVIL DEPARTMENT.

INWARD No. 4625 OF 1934

The District Judge of East Khairullesh
No. 2233 dated 20-9-1934

Certifies full execution of the High Court's
Writ No. 4176 dated 23-8-1934,
forwarding copy of the ~~decree~~ or order in

Card Revision Application

Appeal No. 390 of 1933 from ~~Appellate~~
~~Original~~

~~Decree.~~

Record.

[Signature]

Assistant Registrar.

13

Received on the 21-9-1934.

Sent to the Record-keeper with all papers
complete on the 3-10-34

[Signature]
Assistant Sheristadar.

Received and entered in Catalogue of
Appeals.

Placed on the Shelf,

[Signature]

Record Keeper.

19/10/34